

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No. 0771MH-42176-US

In Re Application of:

FRED A. ANTONINI

Serial No: **10/524,367**

Filed: **11 FEBRUARY 2005**

For: **ADHESIVE BACKED SKINS AND
GRIPS FOR HANDHELD DEVICES**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Examiner: **LONEY, DONALD J.**

Art Unit: **1794**

Confirmation No.: **9853**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114


Filed via EFS-Web

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 is being filed in response to the Final Office Action dated 3 March 2010, which provides for a three-month response period ending 3 June 2010. A Request for Continued Examination is being filed herewith.

Please enter the following amendments and consider the following remarks prior to examining the subject application.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C)	
Date of Transmission:	<u>5/18/10</u>
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO electronic filing system (EFS-Web) on the date shown above.	
By:	<u></u> James E. Walton

INTERVIEW SUMMARY:

The Applicant acknowledges with appreciation Examiner Donald Loney providing an Examiner Interview on 12 May 2010 with Applicant's representatives Richard Eldredge and James E. Walton.

In the Examiner Interview, the Applicant's representative provided distinguishing remarks between the present application and prior art references *Marks* and *Neal*. Specifically, the Applicant's representatives stated that *Marks* fails to disclose or teach a skin comprising an anti-slip layer, wherein the anti-slip layer is composed of a soft, pliable surface for contact with a hard, non-pliable surface, i.e., a car dashboard. The Applicant's representatives pointed out that *Marks* teaches away from the claimed anti-slip layer by disclosing a hard, non-pliable anti-slip material adapted for contact with a soft, pliable contact surface, i.e., a finger or sole of a shoe. The Applicant's representatives then agreed to further amend Claims 1 and 20 to reflect such features. Thereafter, the Applicant's representatives requested that the Examiner review the amendments and contact the Applicant's representative prior to issuing an Office Action in order to expedite the prosecution of the subject application.

The Examiner stated that Claims 1 and 20 should be amended to include additional structural elements, in lieu of unqualified relative terms, to overcome the rejections under 35 USC §§ 102(b) and 103(a).